

1 ***In vitro* and *in vivo* toxicity evaluation of plant virus nanocarriers**

2

3 Agnese Blandino^{1*§}, Chiara Lico^{2*}, Selene Baschieri², Lanfranco Barberini³, Carlo Cirotto³,
4 Paolo Blasi^{1,5}, Luca Santi⁴

5

6 ¹Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Università degli Studi di Perugia, via del Liceo 1,
7 06123, Perugia Italy

8 ²Laboratory of Biotechnology, Technical Unit Radiation Biology and Human Health, ENEA
9 Casaccia Research Center, Via Anguillarese 301, 00123 S. Maria di Galeria, Rome, Italy

10 ³Department of Chemistry, Biology, and Biotechnology, Università degli Studi di Perugia, via
11 elce di sotto, 06123, Perugia Italy

12 ⁴Department of Agriculture, Forests, Nature and Energy (DAFNE), Università della Tuscia, Via
13 San Camillo de Lellis snc, 01100 Viterbo, Italy

14 ⁵Correspondence should be addressed to Paolo Blasi; e-mail: paolo.blasi@unipg.it, phone +39
15 0755852057, fax: +39 0755855123.

16

17 * Agnese Blandino and Chiara Lico contributed equally to this work.

18 § present address: Acraf S.p.A. – Via Vecchia del Pinocchio, 22 60131 Ancona - Italy

19

20

21 **Abstract**

22 The use of biological self-assembling materials and of plant virus nanoparticles (pVNPs) in
23 particular, appears very intriguing because it ensures a great choice of symmetries and
24 dimensions, easy chemical and biological engineering of both surface and/or internal cavity, easy,
25 safe, and rapid production in plants. In this perspective, we started to define the safety profile of
26 two structurally different plant viruses produced in *Nicotiana benthamiana* L. plants: the
27 filamentous Potato virus X and the icosahedral Tomato bushy stunt virus. *In vitro* haemolysis
28 assay was used to test the cytotoxic effects, which could arise by pVNPs interaction with cellular
29 membranes, while early embryo assay was used to evaluate toxicity and teratogenicity *in vivo*.
30 Data indicates that these structurally robust particles, still able to infect plants after incubation in
31 serum up to 24 hours, have neither toxic nor teratogenic effects *in vitro* and *in vivo*. This work
32 represents the first safety-focused characterization of pVNPs in view of their possible use as
33 delivery systems.

34

35

36

37

38

39 **Keywords:** nanoparticles, plant virus nanoparticles, Potato virus X, Tomato bushy stunt virus,
40 drug delivery, toxicity, teratogenicity.

41

42

43 **Introduction**

44 After more than twenty years of academic and industrial research, nanometer-sized carriers,
45 although still in early stages, are becoming a reality in the biomedical field, especially in
46 vaccinology, drug delivery, and diagnostic. Different nanoparticle-based therapeutic and
47 diagnostic agents are under preclinical and clinical evaluation and some of them are already on
48 the market [1]. The most exploited and investigated nanoparticles (NPs) are those based on
49 organic (e.g., lipids, polymers) and inorganic (e.g., metal, metal oxide) materials [2, 3].
50 Nonetheless, due to the extremely complex features that an ideal nano-delivery system should
51 possess to achieve clinical application, none of these carriers is immune from drawbacks (e.g.
52 difficult large-scale manufacturing, poor long-term stability, *in vivo* toxicity) [4, 5].

53 In this scenario, the crosspollination between biotechnology, nanoscience, nanotechnology,
54 pharmaceuticals and biomedicine is shifting the attention to bioinspired and/or bioengineered
55 nanocarriers [6]. Nanoparticles derived from natural macromolecules self-assembly are
56 considered extremely promising. Among the various bio-building blocks, self-assembling
57 proteins have unique features as they can form supramolecular structures giving rise to
58 symmetrical nano-objects [7]. These so called ‘protein cages’ can be made of ferritin-like
59 proteins, chaperons, heat shock proteins and, most notably, viral proteins [8, 9]. The majority of
60 virus nanoparticles (VNPs) display a spherical or a rod shape, and can be surprisingly diverse in
61 terms of symmetries, dimensions and structure related properties. Additional intriguing features
62 include the inherent monodispersity and extreme flexibility in terms of engineering strategies, the
63 latter allowing the effective modification of the exposed surfaces and/or the exploitation of the
64 internal cavity for cargo storage. For these reasons, VNPs have been used since the dawn of
65 nanotechnology and are objects of intense research in the fields of targeted delivery, vaccinology,
66 and imaging [10]. In this context, plant VNPs (pVNPs) are attracting increasing attention. Several
67 plant viruses have been exploited for biomedical applications and tested efficiently in animal
68 models [11]. Plants, such as the *Solanacea Nicotiana benthamiana* L., relative of common
69 tobacco, allow a convenient and easily scalable production of pVNPs that, when outside their
70 specific plant host, become protein nanoshells unable to replicate.

71 In this study we have focused on two distinct pVNPs-based systems: Potato virus X (PVX), the
72 type member of the genus *Potexvirus* (*Alphaflexiviridae* family), and Tomato bushy stunt virus

73 (TBSV), the prototype member of the genus *Tombusvirus* (*Tombusviridae* family). Both viruses
74 have a monopartite single stranded, positive-sense RNA genome. PVX is a flexible filamentous
75 virus of ~500 nm in length and 15 nm in diameter, constituted by approximately 1300 units of a
76 unique coat protein (CP). TBSV is a spherical virus of about 30 nm in diameter with 180 copies
77 of the CP self-assembled to form a T = 3 icosahedral symmetry.

78 Both systems have been extensively explored as nanocarriers and the most investigated
79 application is drug targeting to tumor cells. CP genetic engineering can be used to arrange the
80 covalent binding of exogenous molecules (chemical derivatization strategy), such as drugs,
81 targeting moieties, or to display peptide sequences that bind selectively to a specific receptor
82 overexpressed on cancer cells (genetic engineering strategy). For instance, PVX and TBSV CP
83 have been engineered to display heterologous polypeptides at their N- or C-terminus [12- 14].
84 Regions generating external loops following CP folding have been used for the same purpose in
85 Cowpea mosaic virus [15].

86 Peculiar virus features have allowed the development of 2 different methods of particle loading:
87 reversal viral pore gating (also termed infusion) and *in vitro* controlled reassembly [11]. By
88 choosing the adequate strategy, virtually all kind of drug can be loaded in the virus core.

89 Reversal viral pore gating rely on reversible conformation changes of capsid structure that
90 generate pores. These pores allow the diffusion into the viral core of molecules that are entrapped
91 upon the recovery of the native structure. This loading method is very efficient but is limited to
92 molecules smaller than the pore size. It was estimated that about 900-1000 doxorubicin
93 molecules could be encapsulated in a Red clover necrotic mosaic virus protein cage. This loading
94 density (number of doxorubicin molecule/particle volume) is comparable to that of Doxil[®], an
95 approved liposomal doxorubicin formulation [16, 17].

96 *In vitro* controlled reassembly contemplate viral particle disassembling and reassembling *in vitro*
97 in the presence of the material to be encapsulated. This method has allowed the encapsulation of
98 larger molecules (e.g. nucleic acids, proteins, synthetic macromolecules) [18, 19] and
99 nanoparticles [20].

100 Protein based NPs such as PVX and TBSV are considered ideal in terms of biocompatibility,
101 because their biodegradability should prevent toxicity due to accumulation in the body (i.e. waste

102 excretion). Plant viruses have evolved to infect plant hosts, and to this aim have developed
103 infection strategies totally different from those adopted by animal viruses. Due to the lack of
104 specific receptors for recognition and entry into host cells they cannot infect human cells.
105 Nonetheless, even if they behave in these systems as unreplicative and biologically safe nano-
106 objects, a possible intrinsic toxicity cannot be underestimated.

107 This work represents a first step for the safety evaluation of PVX and TBSV in view of their
108 forthcoming use as functionalized nanocarriers. *In vitro* haemolysis assay has been employed to
109 test cytotoxic effects, which could arise by their interaction with cellular membranes, while early
110 embryo assay (EEA) was used to evaluate toxicity and teratogenicity *in vivo*.

111

112 **Materials and Methods**

113

114 **Production and molecular characterization of pVNPs**

115 PVX and TBSV propagation in *Nicotiana benthamiana* L. plants such as extraction and
116 purification from plant tissues were performed as previously described [12- 14]. Protein
117 concentration (i.e. CP concentration) in each preparation was determined using the bicinchoninic
118 acid protein assay kit (Pierce, Thermo Fisher Scientific, Rockford, IL, USA) and further verified
119 through 12.5% (w/v) sodium dodecyl sulfate-polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (SDS-PAGE) of
120 several dilutions of purified pVNPs and known quantities of bovine serum albumin (BSA; Sigma
121 Chemical Co., St. Louis, MO, USA) comparing the intensities of Coomassie-stained bands.
122 Purity was verified through SDS-PAGE and silver staining. The viral yield was calculated
123 referring to the grams of fresh leaves tissue used for the extraction.

124

125 **Structural characterization of the particles**

126 NPs were morphologically characterized by transmission electron microscopy (TEM; Philips EM
127 400 T microscope, Eindhoven, The Netherlands). A drop of the purified pVNP suspension was
128 deposited on the surface of a 200 mesh formvar[®] coated copper grid (TAAB Laboratories
129 Equipment Ltd., Aldermaston, UK) previously treated with a poly-l-lysine solution. After 3 min,
130 the pVNPs suspension was drawn off and replaced with a drop of negative staining agent (2%
131 w/v phosphotungstic acid, pH 6.5). After 2 min, the stain drop was drawn off and the sample
132 dried at room temperature (r.t.). Carbon nanoparticles (CNPs) (Sigma Aldrich Co., Saint Louis,
133 MO, USA) and single wall carbon nanotubes (SWCNTs) [21] were suspended under sonication
134 in ultrapure water and ethanol, respectively, and placed on 200 mesh formvar[®] coated copper
135 grids. The samples were dried at r.t. and observed without negative staining.

136 Particles size was evaluated by dynamic light scattering (DLS), using a Nicomp 380
137 autocorrelator (PSS Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, USA) equipped with a Coherent Innova 70-3 (Laser
138 Innovation, Moorpark, CA, USA) argon ion laser and a Peltier device for temperature control.
139 The scattered light was detected at 90° from the incident light. TBSV samples were prepared by

140 dispersing 250 µg of viral particles in 250 µL of acetate buffer (50 mM, pH 5.2) while CNPs
141 (nominal particle size determined by TEM <50 nm; Sigma Aldrich Co., Saint Louis, MO, USA)
142 were dispersed in ultrapure water. Analyses were performed at 20°C, for 15 min, in triplicate.

143

144 **Incubation of pVNPs in murine serum and plants infection**

145 Whole blood was collected from C57BL/6J mice (Harlan Laboratories, Inc. Indianapolis, IN,
146 USA) and allowed to clot by incubation at r.t. 15 min. The clot was pelleted through
147 centrifugation at 2000 x g for 10 min at 4°C and the overlying serum collected. pVNPs were
148 diluted in serum at a concentration of 400 ng/µl and incubated at 37°C for 0.5, 2, 4 and 24 h. In
149 control samples pVNPs were diluted and incubated with phosphate buffered saline (PBS; 10mM
150 Na₂HPO₄, 10mM NaH₂PO₄, 150 mM NaCl, pH 7.2). At each time interval, an aliquot of pVNPs
151 was collected and used to infect *N. benthamiana* L. plants, as described above (with 20, 2 or 0.2
152 µg/leaf). As additional control, plants were infected with 20 µg/leaf of pVNPs diluted in PBS or
153 serum but not incubated at 37°C, to test if serum *per se* could hamper viral infectivity.
154 Plants were daily controlled to monitor the onset of infection symptoms.

155

156 **Haemolysis assay**

157 Human blood was drawn in S-monovettes (Sarstedt, Nümbrecht, Germany) containing EDTA-K₃
158 as anti-coagulant. Red blood cells (RBCs) were washed three times with 0.9% NaCl by
159 centrifugation at 1200 x g, r.t., no brake for 10 min and then suspended in Dulbecco's PBS Ca²⁺
160 and Mg²⁺ Free (DPBS CMF) (1:10). Two hundred µl of the RDBs suspension (corresponding to
161 about 9x10⁷ cells) were distributed in triplicate into Eppendorf tubes containing 800 µl of 10%
162 triton X-100 (positive control), DPBS CMF (negative control) or DPBS CMF added with
163 different quantities (10, 100 or 200 µg) of pVNPs. The tubes were incubated at 37°C and mixed
164 by inversion every 30 min. After 6 h all the samples were centrifuged at 1200 x g, r.t., no brake,
165 10 min. The supernatant of each sample was transferred in clean tubes to which 1/10 of the
166 volume of Drabkin's reagent (Sigma Chemical Co., St. Louis, MO, USA) was added before
167 optical density reading at 540 nm (O.D.₅₄₀). The mean of O.D.₅₄₀ readings for each triplicate was
168 obtained, and the percentage of hemolysis was calculated using the equation [(A-B)/(C-B)]x100,

169 where A is the absorbance of the pVNP-treated sample, B is the absorbance of the negative
170 control (blood cells incubated in DPBS CMF) and C is the absorbance of the positive control
171 (blood cells incubated in triton X-100).

172

173 **Chick embryo conditioning and treatment (early embryo assay, EEA)**

174 Fertilized eggs (Cerquaglia Farm, Marsciano, Italy) were incubated on their side with small end
175 pointed slightly down at 38°C and 60% relative humidity in an egg incubator. After 16 h,
176 corresponding to Hamilton and Hamburger (H & H) development stage 3 [22], eggshells were
177 cleaned with ethanol 70% and transferred under a sterile hood for further manipulations.

178 Embryos were divided in eight groups, consisting of three negative controls (untreated, simply
179 pierced with the syringe needle or treated with chicken saline, 0.75% w/v NaCl), three positive
180 controls (treated with 20 µg/egg retinoic acid (Comifar, Novate Milanese, Milano, Italy), 10
181 µg/egg CNPs, 10 µg/egg SWCNTs), and two groups treated with pVNPs at five different
182 concentrations (1, 10, 100 ng/egg, and 1, 10 µg/egg). Plant virus NPs and CNPs were suspended
183 in chicken saline. Due to the extremely poor water solubility of retinoic acid and strong
184 hydrophobicity of native SWCNTs, in this case corn oil was used as vehicle instead of saline.

185 To allow 22 gauge needle penetration and injection, a small piece of eggshell (about 2 mm) was
186 removed from the egg acute pole. One hundred µl were carefully injected in the yolk sac,
187 introducing the whole length of the needle (4 cm) to achieve the central part of the yolk. After
188 treatment, the pierce was closed with adhesive tape to avoid microbial contamination and water
189 loss. Treated embryos, as well as control embryos, were incubated at 38°C and 60% relative
190 humidity for additional 26 h.

191

192 **Toxicity and teratogenicity evaluation**

193 Twenty-six hours after treatment, eggshells were opened and embryos carefully evaluated to
194 individuate non-fertile eggs, embryos died before treatment, embryos died after treatment, and
195 viable embryos. Thereafter, the blastodiscs of all the embryos were carefully removed from the
196 yolk surface, washed with saline, observed and photographed using a stereomicroscope (Leica

197 WILD M32 with WILD PLAN 1X ocular; Leica, Wetzlar, Germany) equipped with a digital
198 camera, and finally fixed with a 4% w/v paraformaldehyde solution.

199 Embryos representative of each group were stained with haematoxylin (Merck, Rahway, NJ,
200 USA) and eosin (Carlo Erba, Milano, Italy) and mounted on glass slides with coverslips.

201 Toxicity was evaluated by comparing with the negative control both the number of dead embryos
202 (died after treatment) as well as the number of somites. Teratogenicity was evaluated by
203 analysing, qualitatively and quantitatively, somites, vascular area, and neural tube deformities.

204

205 **Statistical analysis**

206 Chi-square statistical test was used to test the null hypothesis (i.e. no significant difference
207 between the expected and observed result). In particular, the number of embryos survived to the
208 different treatments and the number of embryos survived in the untreated group (negative
209 control) were compared.

210 To determine if the mean number of somites and standard deviation of the treated and untreated
211 embryos were significantly different from each other Student's t-test was applied ($P > 0.05$ gave a
212 not significant statistical difference).

213

214

215 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

216 *Viral and carbon nanoparticle characterization*

217 *Nicotiana benthamiana* L. [23] plants were grown in an hydroponic system in a containment
218 greenhouse, with microbiologically controlled water supplemented with a three parts nutrient
219 (Flora SeriesTM: FloraMicro, FloraGro and FloraBloom) following the instructions of the
220 manufacturer (General Hydroponics). Light (16/8 h day/night cycle; daily light integral 3.9
221 moles/day; photosynthetically active radiation 136 $\mu\text{mol}/\text{m}^2/\text{s}$), temperature (25°C) and relative
222 humidity (84%) were controlled. Six to 8 weeks after germination, plants were infected with
223 PVX or TBSV. Between 7 and 10 days post infection (d.p.i.) all leaves showing infection
224 symptoms were harvested, weighted and processed for virus extraction and purification. Viruses
225 usually need about 7 days to spread throughout the plant (systemically), inducing leave
226 alterations such as mottling, severe distortion, stunting, chlorosis and mosaic (Figure 1a and 1d).
227 At later stages (11-14 d.p.i.), infection progression leads to necrosis of the apical shoots and,
228 finally, to plant death. Viruses were purified from systemically infected leaves and recovered
229 with yields ranging from 0.2 to 0.6 or even 1 mg/g of fresh leaves tissue, with lower yields
230 associated to PVX, more difficult to extract and purify due to its filamentous nature. To verify the
231 quality of the purification, pVNPs were analysed through SDS-PAGE. After electrophoretic
232 separation and silver staining of the gel a single band corresponding to the viral CP (approximate
233 expected molecular masses: PVX, 25 kDa; TBSV, 41 kDa) was visible for both TBSV and PVX
234 NPs (Figure 1c and 1f). Gel staining with Coomassie blue using different dilutions of a quantified
235 reference protein was also performed to confirm the yield rate (data not shown).

236 Purified pVNPs were further characterized through electron microscopy. The TEM
237 photomicrographs of TBSV showed morphologically homogenous particles (Figure 1b), with
238 regular shape and average diameter of ~ 30 nm [14]. PVX photomicrographs evidenced a
239 filamentous and flexuous structure less homogenous in size. As expected, beside whole particles
240 of ~ 500 nm in length, 8-10% of shorter rods were also present [24, 25]. The bimodal distribution
241 is not an artifact of purification but a specific product of PVX replication strategy [24]. Notably,
242 all PVX NPs were consistent in the diameter size (15 nm) (Figure 1e).

243 Due to the particulate nature of TBSV and PVX, CNPs and SWCNTs of similar size and shape
244 have been characterized and employed as positive controls in EEA. TEM confirmed that CNPs
245 have spherical shape and a mean particle diameter of about 30-40 nm (Figure 2a), compatible

246 with the nominal size reported by the supplier (i.e. <50 nm). SWCNTs appeared to form
247 aggregates (Figure 2b). This is due to the high lipophilicity of SWCNTs that are well dispersed as
248 single particles in a limited number of solvents, such as dimethyl sulfoxide that, due to the
249 incompatibility with the Formvar[®] film of the TEM grid, could not be used for sample
250 preparation. SWCNTs were dispersed in ethanol with the aid of ultrasounds but because of the
251 non-optimal solvent properties and solvent evaporation, aggregation took place.

252 DLS analysis of TBSV confirmed TEM observations, indicating that the mean hydrodynamic
253 diameter (mhd) of the particles is of 33.5 ± 0.2 nm with a very narrow Gaussian distribution
254 width (4.73 ± 0.05 nm) (Figure 3). DLS showed the presence in the CNPs suspensions of 2
255 populations: one with a mhd of 35.2 nm (~90%) and another with a mhd around 540 nm (~10%)
256 (Figure 3).

257 PVX and SWCNTs, being filamentous, could not be analysed by DLS since this technique allows
258 to consistently estimate the dimensions of spherical objects only. Even if some attempts to use
259 this approach to size tubular particles have been reported, the results are not reliable as the
260 estimated mhd does not correspond only to one filament dimension (length or diameter) but to a
261 combination of the two values [26- 28]. PVX particles diameters were determined through
262 electron microscopy and showed the expected sizes [25].

263

264 *pVNPs serum stability*

265 NPs intended for drug delivery must circulate in the blood for a sufficiently long period of time
266 to accumulate at the target site and, in order to maintain efficacy after intravenous injection, the
267 interaction with serum proteins must not induce their proteolysis/disassembly and drug
268 release/unloading. For this reason, the stability in serum is a fundamental requisite.

269 A negative effect of pVNPs interaction with blood components has been suggested for Cowpea
270 Mosaic Virus (CPMV) NPs that, following incubation with plasma and/or serum, were
271 significantly inhibited in their plant infectivity [29].

272 To verify if plasma/serum components have negative effects on TBSV and PVX, the pVNPs
273 were incubated at 37°C for 24 h with either mouse serum or PBS, and then used to inoculate *N.*
274 *benthamiana* L. plants at three different dilutions, monitoring daily the onset of symptoms.
275 Symptoms first appeared, in a dose dependent fashion, on plants infected with TBSV that is more
276 aggressive than PVX. Plants inoculated with 20 µg/leaf showed first systemic symptoms at day 4

277 for TBSV and at day 6 for PVX. Plants infected with the lowest dose (0.2 µg/leaf) showed a
278 delay in symptoms appearance (day 8 for TBSV and day 10 for PVX), although both pVNPs
279 finally spread systemically in all plants (data not shown).

280 These results clearly indicated that both pVNPs are extremely robust and maintain their integrity
281 as well as their ability to infect plants up to 24 h after of incubation in PBS or serum.

282

283 ***In vitro haemolysis assay***

284 During blood stream circulation, NPs should not affect the integrity of cellular components,
285 erythrocytes in particular. *In vitro* haemolysis assay is recommended by US Food and Drug
286 Administration for excipients intended for intravenous administration
287 (<http://www.fda.gov/ohrms/dockets/98fr/2002d-0389-gdl0002.pdf>).

288 An *in vitro* haemolysis assay was performed to determine any detrimental effect exerted by PVX
289 and TBSV on erythrocytes. Haemolysis assays indicated that 10 µg of both PVX and TBSV had
290 no effects on erythrocytes integrity. At the higher concentrations TBSV still behave as the
291 negative control, while PVX appears to induce a slight and dose-dependent haemolysis rate (1.8
292 and 2.7 % for 100 and 200 µg, respectively). The reason of this different behaviour is probably
293 ascribable at one of the many features that distinguish the two pVNPs (e.g., shape, surface
294 charge, and dimensions). However, it must also be mentioned that this rate of haemolysis is far
295 less the tolerated 5% threshold considered the critical safe haemolytic ratio for biomaterials
296 according to ISO/TR 7406 [30, 31]. Moreover, this effect is observed in experimental conditions
297 that are very different and ‘extreme’ in terms of NPs/erythrocytes ratio and of interaction
298 duration with blood cell components compared to those generally reported in literature.

299

300 ***Toxicity and teratogenicity in chicken embryos***

301 Chicken embryo has been used extensively in experimental embryology and development
302 biology. It has been employed as animal model for toxicity and teratogenicity tests after the
303 pioneering work of McLaughlin in 1963 [32- 35]. In the 1990s, two experimental protocols were
304 developed: chick embryotoxicity screening test (CHEST) [36], to evaluate pharmacological
305 agents, and EEA [37], to evaluate teratogen potential during the first week of embryonic
306 development. Due to the large number of results collected from this animal model, chicken
307 embryo is considered an excellent model for assessing potential toxicity and teratogenicity [38].

308 However, the reliability of the model depends on a series of critical factors all contemplated and
309 carefully respected in the present study. In particular, (i) adequate negative and positive controls,
310 (ii) use of a minimum of 10 eggs per dose (20 is considered ideal), and (iii) right volume and
311 route of administration [38].

312 Figure 4 shows embryos' viability of about 90% in the negative control (untreated) and a mean
313 number of somites around 14-15 as reported in the H & H developmental stage 11-12 [22]. The
314 two additional negative controls (i.e. simply pierced and treated with chicken saline), included to
315 validate the injection manoeuvre and the injected volume, had the same mortality and the same
316 number of somites of the untreated group [39]. Retinoic acid injection produced a significant
317 abortifacient activity ($P < 0.01$) and a significant delay in somitogenesis ($P < 0.01$), both
318 indicators of toxicity (Figure 4) [40, 41], inducing malformations in 54% of the survived embryos
319 [42]. Figure 5b shows a classical example of malformations induced by retinoic acid on the
320 somites and the neural tube: two or more somites merge together and/or with the neural tube
321 forming what is known as 'zig-zag neural tube' or 'zig-zag somites' [42]. CNPs and SWCNTs
322 were chosen as additional positive controls for their similarities in shape and size with TBSV and
323 PVX and for their known toxic activity [43- 46]. CNPs induced high toxicity and teratogenicity
324 with 50% of mortality and malformations in all the viable embryos (i.e., abnormal somites
325 morphology, open neural channel and lacerations of the area pellucida) (Figure 5c). SWCNTs
326 induced toxicity in terms of mortality but not in terms of alteration of the somites number. A low
327 frequency of malformations has been recorded but even though embryos presented the right
328 number of somites, the bodies were generally smaller (Figure 5d) .

329 TBSV and PVX, once injected at doses ranging from 1 ng to 10 μ g/embryo, did not show neither
330 signs of toxicity nor signs of teratogenicity. The viability was sometimes slightly lower than 90%
331 but no significant differences were observed with the negative controls ($P > 0.05$). The mean
332 number of somites, a well-established indicator of toxicity, did not show significant statistical
333 differences when compared to the negative controls (Figure 4). Malformations were not recorded
334 in TBSV and PVX treated groups. Photomicrographs of embryos treated with TBSV (Figure 1s),
335 reported as an example, showed size and general morphology comparable to that of the negative
336 controls (Figure 5a). In fact, embryos at the H & H stage 11-12 (stage 11: 40-45 h, 13 somites;
337 stage 12: 45-49 h, 16 somites) present the heart bent to right and slightly S-shaped and the
338 forebrain covered by the headfold of amnion [47]. Higher magnification, together with

339 haematoxylin and eosin staining, allowed to prove a correct somitogenesis, the absence of fused
340 somites and/or deformities of the neural channel (Figure 1s).

341 At the five concentrations evaluated, TBSV and PVX show neither toxicity nor teratogenicity on
342 chicken embryos when compared to positive controls: retinoic acid, CNPs, and SWCNTs. In
343 contrast to the absence of effects induced by the differently shaped pVNPs, a big difference is
344 evident in the effects produced in terms of toxicity and teratogenicity by the differently shaped
345 carbon nanostructures. CNPs appear to induce more pronounced damages, and this may be
346 ascribed at first instance to characteristics related to their physico-chemical nature. In fact, CNPs
347 were easily dispersed in an aqueous solvent (saline 0.75% w/v) while SWCNTs required the use
348 of corn oil as organic solvent [48]. Even if SWCNTs seemed well dispersed in the oil, when
349 explanting the blastodisk it was possible to observe black spots in the yolk indicating post-
350 injection aggregation (data not shown). The shifting from nanomaterials (of definite size and
351 morphology) to micrometric aggregates with lower surface-area-to-volume ratio, strongly
352 changes the interactions with biological systems, including the possible reduction of the toxic
353 potential.

354

355 **CONCLUSIONS**

356 The overall morphological and structural analysis of both pVNPs confirmed the reliability of
357 these “objects” as carriers for drug delivery and the superiority of their production system (plants
358 bio-factories) if compared to conventional ones.

359 The overall toxicological analysis indicate that TBSV and PVX are not haemolytic *in vitro*, nor
360 teratogenic or toxic in the chicken embryo model. These data are fundamental for the correct and
361 safe development of these carriers in the light of future clinical applications.

362 Finally, even if TBSV seems more versatile in this field of application thanks to its ability to load
363 at its interior a drug cargo, the flexible filamentous shape of PVX could represent an added value
364 in view of possible applications in nanomedicine due to their superior pharmacokinetic and
365 tumour homing properties. In fact, in spite of the length heterogeneity, a problem that can be
366 solved through further gradient purification steps, the use of filamentous nano-objects has been
367 explored and seems to have different *in vivo* behaviour as compared to spherical particles.

368 **Declaration of interests**

369 The Authors declare no conflict of interest.

370

371 **References**

- 372 1. V. Wagner, A. Dullaart, A.K. Bock and A. Zweck, *Nat. Biotech.* 24 (2006) 1211.
- 373 2. J.S. Weinstein, C.G. Varallyay, E. Dosa, S. Gahramanov, B. Hamilton, W.D. Rooney,
374 L.L. Muldoon and E.A. Neuwelt, *J. Cereb. Blood Flow. Metab.* 30 (2010) 15.
- 375 3. C.L. Ventola, *P&T* 37 (2012) 512.
- 376 4. O.C. Farokhzad and R. Langer, *ACS Nano* 3 (2009) 16.
- 377 5. O.C. Farokhzad and R. Langer, *Adv. Drug Deliv. Rev.* 58 (2006) 1456.
- 378 6. J.W. Yoo, D.J. Irvine, D.E. Discher and S. Mitragotri, *Nat. Rev. Drug Discov.* 10(2011)
379 521.
- 380 7. C. Alvarez-Lorenzo and A. Concheiro, *Curr. Opin. Biotechnol.* 24 (2013) 1167.
- 381 8. Z. Liu, J. Qiao, Z. Niu and Q. Wang, *Chem. Soc. Rev.* 41 (2012) 6178.
- 382 9. Y. Ma, R.J. Nolte and J.J. Cornelissen, *Adv. Drug. Deliv. Rev.* 64 (2012) 811.
- 383 10. S. Grasso and L. Santi, *Int. J. Physiol. Pathophysiol. Pharmacol.* 2 (2010) 161.
- 384 11. C. Lico, A. Schoubben, S. Baschieri, P. Blasi and L. Santi, *Curr. Med. Chem.* 20 (2013)
385 3471.
- 386 12. C. Lico, F. Capuano, G. Renzone, M. Donini, C. Marusic, A. Scaloni, E. Benvenuto and
387 S. Baschieri, *J. Gen. Virol.* 87 (2006) 3103.
- 388 13. C. Lico, C. Mancini, P. Italiani, C. Betti, D. Boraschi, E. Benvenuto and S. Baschieri,
389 *Vaccine* 27 (2009) 5069.
- 390 14. S. Grasso, C. Lico, F. Imperatori and L. Santi, *Transgenic Res.* 22 (2013) 519.
- 391 15. F. Sainsbury, M.C. Canizares, and G.P. Lomonossoff, *Rev. Phytopathol.* 48 (2010) 437.
- 392 16. Y. Ren, S.M. Wong, L.-Y. Lim, *Bioconjug. Chem.* 18 (2007) 836.
- 393 17. L. Loo, R. H. Guenther, S.A.Lommel, and S. Franzen, *Chem. Commun.* 1 (2008) 88.
- 394 18. X. Lu, J.R. Thompson, K.L. Perry, *J. Gen. Virol.* 93 (2012) 1120.
- 395 19. Y. Ren, S.M. Wong, L.Y. Lim, *J. Gen. Virol.* 87 (2006) 2749.
- 396 20. L. Loo, R.H. Guenther, V.R. Basnayake, S.A. Lommel, S. Franzen, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*
397 128 (2006) 4502.

- 398 21. A. Policicchio, T. Caruso, G. Chiarello, E. Colavita, V. Formoso, R.G. Agostino, T.
399 Tsoufis, D. Gournis and S. La Rosa, *Surf. Sci.* 601 (2007) 2823.
- 400 22. V. Hamburger and H.L. Hamilton, *J. Morphol.* 88 (1951) 49.
- 401 23. M.M. Goodin, D. Zaitlin, R.A. Naidu and S.A. Lommel, *Mol. Plant. Microbe Interact.* 21
402 (2008) 1015.
- 403 24. M. Price, *J. Virol.* 67 (2003) 596.
- 404 25. C. Betti, C. Lico, D. Maffi, S. D'Angeli, M.M. Altamura, E. Benvenuto, F. Faoro and S.
405 Baschieri, *Mol. Plant. Pathol.* 13 (2012) 198.
- 406 26. X. Cheng, J. Zhong, J. Meng, M. Yang, F. Jia, Z. Xu, H. Kong and H. Xu, *J. Nanomater.*
407 2011;Article ID 938491.
- 408 27. Y.K. Moon, J. Lee, J.K. Lee, T.K. Kim and S.H. Kim, *Langmuir* 25 (2009) 1739.
- 409 28. B. Smith, K. Wepasnick, K.E. Schrote, A.R. Bertele, W.P. Ball, C. O'Melia and D.H.
410 Fairbrother, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 43 (2009) 819.
- 411 29. C.S. Rae, I.W. Khor, Q. Wang, G. Destito, M.J. Gonzalez, P. Singh, D.M. Thomas, M.N.
412 Estrada, E. Powell, M.G. Finn and M. Manchester, *Virology* 343 (2005) 224.
- 413 30. Y. Li, J. Liu, Y. Zhong, J. Zhang, Z. Wang, L. Wang, Y. An, M. Lin, Z. Gao and D.
414 Zhang, *Int. J. Nanomedicine.* 6 (2011) 2805.
- 415 31. X. Li, L. Wang, Y. Fan, Q. Feng and F.Z. Cui, *J. Nanomater.* 2012;Article ID 548389.
- 416 32. J. Jr. McLaughlin, J.P. Marliac, M.J. Verret, M.K. Mutchler and O.G. Fitzhugh, *Toxicol.*
417 *Appl. Pharmacol.* 5 (1963) 760.
- 418 33. D.J. Hoffman and G.M. Ramm, *J. Exp. Zool.* 182 (1972) 227.
- 419 34. B. Brunström, *Arch. Toxicol.* 54 (1983) 353.
- 420 35. B. Brunström and P.O. Darnerud, *Toxicology*, 27 (1983)103.
- 421 36. R. Jelínek and O. Marhan, *Funct. Dev. Morphol.* 4 (1994) 317.
- 422 37. D.S. Henshel, Abstracts of the 14th annual meeting of the Society of Environmental
423 Toxicology and Chemistry, Houston, 2-6 November 1993.
- 424 38. D.S. Henshel, J. DeWitt and A. Troutman *Curr. Protoc. Toxicol.* 13 (2003) 1.

- 425 39. D.C. Deeming and M.W.J. Ferguson (Eds.), *Egg Incubation: Its Effects on Embryonic*
426 *Development in Birds and Reptiles*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991.
- 427 40. K. Palén and L. Thörneby *J. Embryol. Exp. Morphol.* 61 (1981) 175.
- 428 41. G.L. Jr. Barnes, B.D. Mariani and R.S. Tuan, *Teratology* 54 (1996) 93.
- 429 42. C.M. Griffith, M.J. Wiley *Teratology*. 43 (1991) 217.
- 430 43. K. Inoue, R. Yanagisawa, E. Koike, R. Nakamura, T. Ichinose, S. Tasaka, M. Kiyono and
431 H. Takano, *Basic Clin. Pharmacol. Toxicol.* 108 (2011) 234
- 432 44. P.G. Barlow, A. Clouter-Baker, K. Donaldson, J. Maccallum and V. Stone, *Part. Fibre*
433 *Toxicol.* 2 (2005) 11.
- 434 45. P.H. Chen, K.M. Hsiao and C.C. Chou, *Biomaterials* 34 (2013) 5661.
- 435 46. H.J. Johnston, G.R. Hutchison, F.M. Christensen, S. Peters, S. Hankin, K. Aschberger and
436 V. Stone, *Nanotoxicology* 4 (2010) 207.
- 437 47. A.L. Romanoff (Ed.), *The Avian Embryo: Structural and Functional Development*,
438 Macmillan, New York, 1960.
- 439 48. X, Cheng, J, Zhong, J, Meng, M, Yang, F, Jia, Z, Xu, H, Kong and H. Xu, *J. Nanomater.*
440 2011;Article ID 938491.